

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

No claims are currently being amended, added or canceled.

Claims 9-24 and 29-31 remain pending in this application.

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter made in the Office Action with respect to claims 10, 12, 16, 19-23 and 31.

In the Office Action, claims 9, 11, 13 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,061,650 to Malkin; claims 14, 15, 17, 18 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkin in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,804 to Schroderus; and claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkin and Schroderus in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,159,592 to Perkins. These rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons given below.

First, regarding the independent claim 9, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that column 4, lines 15-20 and column 3, lines 35-38 of Malkin discloses the claimed user-input-based information transmission unit.

However, column 4, lines 15-20 of Malkin describes an authentication request generated by a Remote Access Server (RAS), which will then be sent to a gateway. The RAS is described as functioning as a Foreign Agent (see column 6, line 13 of Malkin) in a service provider network (see Figure 1 of Malkin), whereas the gateway is described as functioning as a Home Agent (see column 6, line 3 of Malkin). Thus, what is actually described in column 4, lines 15-20 of Malkin is the generation of the authentication request at the Foreign Agent and the subsequent transmission of the authentication request from the Foreign Agent to the Home Agent. Malkin's RAS clearly does not correspond in any manner to a mobile computer management device (home agent) in a home network of a mobile computer device, and so Malkin's RAS does not have any function for managing the current location of a mobile computer device.

Also, please note that Malkin's RAS is clearly not a mobile computer device either, and thus column 4, lines 15-20 of Malkin provides no teaching or suggestion regarding a constituent element of the mobile computer device such as the claimed user-input-based information transmission unit.

Also, column 3, lines 35-38 of Malkin describes the operation of the RAS to send a CHAP challenge or a PAP message to the remote node (mobile computer device). What the remote node returns to the RAS in response is a set of user authentication information (see column 3, lines 39-40 of Malkin), which is different from the authentication request described in column 4, lines 15-20 of Malkin.

Moreover, claim 9 explicitly requires that the response message is to be transmitted to the mobile computer management device (home agent), not a foreign agent, and that this is to be done when the challenge message is received from the mobile computer management device in response to the registration message that is originally sent by the registration message transmission unit. In this regard, Malkin fails to teach or suggest any relationship between the user authentication information sent from the remote node to the RAS as described in column 3, lines 38-40 of Malkin, and the registration request sent from the remote node to the home agent as described in column 6, lines 25-30 of Malkin.

Consequently, Malkin fails to mention any sending of user-input-based information to a mobile computer management device in a home network in response to a challenge message from a mobile computer management device in the home network which is sent in response to a registration message from the mobile computer device, as required for the claimed user-input-based information transmission unit.

Thus, Malkin fails to teach or suggest the claimed user-input-based information transmission unit, and thus claim 9 is patentable over the teachings of Malkin.

The same argument also holds for the dependent claims 11 and 13, as well as for the corresponding article of manufacture claim 29.

Next, regarding the independent claim 14, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that column 6, lines 25-30 of Malkin discloses the claimed registration message transmission unit.

However, column 6, lines 25-30 of Malkin only describes the exchange of a Registration Request and Registration Reply, and it fails to teach or suggest anything related to transmitting a registration message from a mobile computer device by using network information read out from an external memory device under control by a user authentication unit, as explicitly required in claim 14.

The Office Action also incorrectly asserts that column 4, lines 15-20 of Malkin discloses the claimed user-input-based information transmission unit.

However, column 4, lines 15-20 of Malkin describes an authentication request generated by a Remote Access Server (RAS), which will then be sent to a gateway. Malkin's RAS is described as functioning as a Foreign Agent (see column 6, line 13 of Malkin) in a service provider network (see Figure 1 of Malkin), whereas the gateway is described as functioning as a Home Agent (see column 6, line 3 of Malkin). Thus, what is actually described in column 4, lines 15-20 of Malkin is the generation of an authentication request at a Foreign Agent and the subsequent transmission of the authentication request from the Foreign Agent to a Home Agent. Malkin's RAS clearly does not correspond in any manner to a mobile computer management device (home agent) in a home network of a mobile computer device, and so Malkin's RAS does not have any function for managing the current location of a mobile computer device.

Malkin's RAS is clearly not a mobile computer device either, and so column 4, lines 15-20 of Malkin contains no teaching or suggestion regarding a constituent element of the mobile computer device such as the claimed user-input-based information transmission unit.

The Office Action correctly acknowledges that Malkin fails to disclose the claimed external interface unit, but then incorrectly asserts that this feature is disclosed in column 1, lines 28-33 and column 9, lines 57-63 of Schroderus.

However, column 1, lines 26-33 of Schroderus only describes mobile equipment that uses a subscriber identity module (SIM) card, which is to be attached to the mobile equipment (see column 10, lines 21-27 of Schroderus), while column 9, lines 57-63 of Schroderus only describes mobile equipment that uses an internally provided memory for storing a protected subscriber identity.

Thus, Schroderus fails to provide any teaching or suggestion of network information to be used in sending a registration message from an external memory device, as required for the claimed external interface unit.

Moreover, there is no sound motivation to consider the incorporation of this SIM card feature of Schroderus into the device of Malkin.

Consequently, Malkin and Schroderus fail to teach or suggest the claimed external interface unit, the claimed registration message transmission unit and the claimed user-input-based information transmission unit, and therefore claim 14 is patentable over the cited art of record. Please also note that Perkins does not rectify the above-mentioned shortcomings of Malkin and Schroderus.

The same argument also holds for the dependent claims 15, 17, 18 and 24, as well as the corresponding article of manufacture claim 30.

Therefore, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

January 28, 2004

Phillip J. Articola

Registration No. 38,819

FOLEY & LARDNER

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5300

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399